

### **REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1, 12, and 13 are amended. The revision to claim 1 is supported, for example, at page 28, lines 22-27 in the specification. Claims 1, 12, and 13 are also amended editorially. Claims 34 and 35 are added. Claim 34 is supported, for example, at page 28, lines 22-27. Claim 35 is supported by original claim 1. Claims 1-35 are pending, with claims 14-33 being withdrawn.

#### **Claim rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-13 stand rejected being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,539,965 (Safari). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 is directed to a piezocomposite comprising a plurality of composite sheet units. The sintered piezoelectric thin wires are arranged on a surface of each resin layer so as to form void portions between adjacent ones of the sintered piezoelectric thin wires. The plurality of composite sheet units are laminated and the laminated composite sheets are integrated.

By the arrangement of the void portions, the density of the piezocomposite can be reduced. This serves to widen the range in which the acoustic impedance can be controlled. In addition, by laminating the composite sheet units and integrating the laminated composite sheets, the flexibility of the piezocomposite can be improved.

Safari relates to a method for making piezoelectric composites. However, Safari does not disclose or suggest the above features. Safari does not teach or suggest that wires are arranged on a surface of resin layers so as to form void portions between adjacent ones of the wires. Nor does Safari teach or suggest laminating the composite sheet units and integrating the laminated composite sheets. Rather, Safari discloses that materials are arranged by providing spacers and a filler material that is provided between the spacers. *See* col. 5, lines 16-26. Then the stack is diced and refilled with a filler material. *See* col. 6, lines 1-4. Accordingly, Safari does not teach or suggest that laminated composite sheet units are integrated as claimed.

Applicants therefore submit that claim 1 is allowable over the cited reference.

Claims 2-11 depend from claim 1, and are believed allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claims 12, 13 and 35 each recite that the feature where a plurality of composite sheet units are integrated together by lamination. As discussed above, Safari does not teach or suggest this feature. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 12, 13 and 35 are also allowable over the cited reference.

**Claim rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claim 4 stands rejected as being unpatentable over Safari. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.


Claim 4 depends from claim 1 and is believed allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Applicants do not concede the correctness of this rejection.

In view of the above, favorable reconsideration in the form of a notice of allowance is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.  
P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
(612) 332-5300

Date: January 23, 2004

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Douglas P. Mueller  
Reg. No. 30,300  
DPM:DTL